

The National Collegiate Athletic Association's Stance on Amateurism

An Honors Thesis (HONRS 499)

by

Samantha K. Bushy

Dr. Maude Jennings

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Maude M. Jennings", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana

April 2001

Graduation Date: May 2001

Acknowledgments

My deepest thanks go to Dr. Maude Jennings, who not only guided me through this thesis' writing, but also through my four years of college. Her patience with me and her willingness to go the extra step to help me has made all the difference in my education, and has provided me with a standard to judge all other educators by. Thanks to Kelly Groddy who steered me in the right direction and provided me with a springboard for my research. Finally, thanks to Mom, Dad, and Mackenzie, who, for four years, have been my long distance sounding board, psychologist, and most treasured friend.

Sp Coll
Thesis
LD
2489
.Z4
2001
.B87

Abstract

The National Collegiate Athletic Association is the governing body for intercollegiate athletics. Throughout its history the NCAA has mandated that in order to compete in collegiate athletics a student-athlete must maintain academic standards and remain an amateur. Currently there are numerous groups who are designing proposals for rules changes to soften the NCAA's stance on amateurism. This thesis reports on the history of the NCAA and the foundation of its amateurism rules. It then discusses the proposed changes currently being considered that would alter these rules. Finally, it presents numerous problems that would occur if the NCAA's stance on amateurism was changed.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association's Stance on Amateurism

Each year millions of children put on their cleats, or swimsuits, or gloves and head out to the field, court, pool, or course. They play team and individual sports. Some play on a local recreational level and others on a regional or national level. Slowly, as they grow older, the number of children competing in athletics will begin to shrink. At the high school level those who are no longer excelling do not make the team. At the college level even fewer athletes have the chance to compete on the intercollegiate stage. After college fewer than one percent of the athletes will continue to compete. Using football as an example, each year approximately 6,240 football players finish their collegiate career. Of these players only 875 will sign a contract and only 300 of those will make it to minicamp. Of the 300 who make it to camp only 215 will eventually make a roster. This small number of National Football League rookies represents only 3 percent of the originally eligible players (Dorsey). The number of basketball players who make it to the National Basketball Association is even smaller because teams carry fewer players. Even the lucky few who make it to the professional leagues will find that their careers are usually short-lived. It has been reported that the average career for a NFL player is less than five years. So at 26 years old these athletes are often out of a job that they trained for from the time they started playing "Pop Warner" football. This effectively ends the athletic career, and is the reason for collegiate athletics.

Collegiate athletics provides a venue for athletes to play their sport at a highly competitive level while receiving an education that in many cases is completely paid for. This education is what will prepare these former athletes for the rest of their lives. For many of these student-athletes, a college athletic scholarship is the only chance that they would have to attend an institution of higher learning. There are relatively few requirements that these athletes must abide by to continue to receive these benefits, but the most important is remaining an amateur. This prompts a question: why must the National Collegiate Athletic Association change its policies on amateurism so that the collegiate game becomes essentially a minor league system? I propose that the NCAA should maintain its stance on amateurism and non-payment of athletes so that all student-athletes will *benefit* from the college athletic and educational experience, not just the one-percent who will make careers out of their athletic talent.

A brief history of the game of football notes that "...it was the flying wedge, football's major offense in 1905, that spurred the formation of the NCAA..." (www.ncaa.org). Before 1905 there were no regulations in collegiate football. Games were filled with gang tackling and mass formations, two dangerous aspects of football. The violence was so serious that in 1905 "...eighteen student-athletes were killed and 149 were seriously injured..." (Brown). In response to these tragic happenings, President Theodore Roosevelt called college athletics leaders to the White House for two conferences to discuss the problem. In December 1905, Chancellor Henry M. MacCracken of New York University held a meeting with 13 schools to draw up changes in the playing rules for intercollegiate football games. At a following meeting on December 28, 1905 in New York City, "...the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the

United States (IAAUS) was founded by 62 members...” (www.ncaa.org). The IAAUS was officially constituted on March 31, 1906, and in 1910 changed its name to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). At first the NCAA was solely a discussion group and rule-making body. Later it began to hold national championships with uniform rules for the universities, as well. In 1921 the NCAA held its first national championships for track and field (Brown).

After World War II a series of crises were brought to the NCAA. First the “Sanity Code” which was “...adopted to establish guidelines for recruiting and financial aid failed to curb abuse involving student athletes...” (www.ncaa.org). Then there was a large increase in the number of postseason collegiate football games. Additionally universities and colleges also began to grow concerned about the effects of unrestricted television on football attendance. These problems demonstrated to the NCAA the need for full-time professional leadership. In 1951 Walter Byers was named the executive director of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and its headquarters were opened in Kansas City, Missouri. In Missouri (1)“...a program to control live television of football games was approved, (2) the annual Convention delegated enforcement powers to the Association’s Council and (3) legislation was adopted governing postseason bowl games...” (www.ncaa.org).

In 1973 the members were divided into three legislative and competitive divisions (Division I, II, and III). “Five years later, Division I members voted to create subdivisions I-A and I-AA in the sport of football...” (www.ncaa.org). In 1980 the NCAA began controlling women’s athletic programs. This same year Divisions II and III established championships in 10 sports for women. “A year later, the historic 75th

Convention adopted an extensive governance plan to include women's athletics programs, services, and representation..." (www.ncaa.org). The delegates then expanded the women's championship program to include 19 events. Today the NCAA is headed by President Cedric W. Dempsey, its third executive director, and has been re-located to Indianapolis, Indiana.

The NCAA considers itself an organization "...through which the nation's colleges and universities speak and act on athletic matters at the national level..." (www.ncaa.org). Currently there are approximately "...1,200 institutions, conferences, organizations, and individuals devoted to the sound administration of intercollegiate athletics..." (www.ncaa.org). Among its stated purposes are:

- ☒ To initiate, stimulate, and improve intercollegiate athletics programs for student-athletes and to promote and develop educational leadership, physical fitness, athletics excellence and athletics participation as a recreational pursuit.
- ☒ To uphold the principle of institutional control of, and responsibility for, all intercollegiate sports conformity with the constitution and bylaws of the Association.
- ☒ To encourage its members to adopt eligibility rules to comply with satisfactory standards of scholarship, sportsmanship and amateurism.
- ☒ To formulate, copyright and publish rules of play governing intercollegiate athletics.
- ☒ To study in general all phases of competitive intercollegiate athletics and establish standards whereby the colleges and universities of the United States can maintain their athletics programs on a high level. (www.ncaa.org)

The NCAA was founded on the idea that collegiate student-athletes should be amateurs. The first official definition of the amateur was published in 1866 by the Amateur Athletic Club of England. The definition stated that an amateur was "...one who never engaged in open competition for prizes or money, never taught athletics as a profession, and was not an artisan, mechanic, or laborer..." (Brown). Although the modern concept of amateurism was in a way defined by class status, "...its basic premise of aversion to compensation developed into the foundation of American college athletics..." (Brown).

The NCAA maintains that only an amateur student-athlete is eligible for intercollegiate athletics participation in a particular sport. Bylaw 12.1.1 from the NCAA Division I Manual states:

An individual loses amateur status and thus shall not be eligible for intercollegiate competition in a particular sport if the individual:

- a) Uses his or her athletics skill (directly or indirectly) for pay in any form in the a sport;
- b) Accepts a promise of pay even if such pay is to be received following completion of intercollegiate athletics participation;
- c) Signs a contract or commitment of any kind to play professional athletics, regardless of its legal enforceability or any consideration received;
- d) Receives, directly or indirectly, a salary, reimbursement of expenses or any other form of financial assistance from a professional sports organization based upon athletics skill or

participation, except as permitted by NCAA rules and regulations;

e) Competes on any professional athletics team and knows (or had reason to know) that the team is a professional athletics team, even if no pay or remuneration for expenses was received; or

f) Enters into a professional draft or agreement with an agent.
(www.ncaa.org)

The manual also states points out that:

“...Student-athletes shall be amateurs in an intercollegiate sport, and their participation should be motivated primarily by education and by the physical, mental, and social benefits to be derived. Student participation in intercollegiate athletics is an avocation, and student-athletes should be protected from exploitation by professional and commercial enterprises...” (www.ncaa.org).

Student-athletes may not sign or orally agree to a contract with a professional team, league or tour. They are not permitted to enter into a contract with an agent. They are not permitted to receive gifts or money from an agent. Student-athletes are also not allowed to receive cash or equivalent awards for participating in an athletic contest. A student-athlete is only permitted to promote a product through advertisement provided:

a) The primary purpose of the advertisement is to publicize the sponsor's congratulations to the student-athlete or team;

- b) The advertisement does not include a reproduction of the product with which the business is associated or any other item or description identifying the business or service other than its name;
- c) There is no indication in the makeup or wording of the advertisement that the squad members, individually or collectively, or the institution endorses the product or service of the advertiser;
- d) The student-athlete has not signed a consent or release granting permission to use the student-athlete's name or picture in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of this section. (www.ncaa.org)

However, even though the NCAA's rules on amateurism are clearly defined and have been instituted since the association's inception, there are still numerous complaints about the rules, which have led to court cases that have been filed against the NCAA.

The biggest complaint against the NCAA's stance on amateurism is that the association exploits its athletes. This complaint has its base in financial remuneration to the organization and others. Opponents feel that the enormous amount of money that the NCAA and schools receive is because of the athletes. Complainants feel that the athletes should receive some of the profit. In 2000, the NCAA increased its annual budget to \$325.6 million (www.totalsports.net). Included in this revenue is \$256.2 million from television, \$24 million from men's Division I basketball sales, \$23.2 million from licensing and royalties, and \$7.5 million from investments. From this revenue \$215.3 million will be distributed to cover Division I expenses. Each Division I school will received \$50,000 for its Academic Enhancement Fund; each conference receives a portion of \$10 million that is used for a Special Assistance fund for Student-Athletes; and

another \$170,000 will be given to each Division I conference to enhance and implement programs in men's and women's basketball officiating, conference compliance, drug education, employment opportunities for ethnic minorities and women, and gambling education programs. Money is also distributed to each institution based on the number of scholarships that they award, distributed to help conferences cover the expense of men's basketball, and distributed to Division II and III schools. (www.ncaa.org)

The only reimbursement that athletes receive for their talent and performance is a scholarship, and many athletes claim that that is not enough when schools and conferences profit so much from their playing. University of Wisconsin football player Bryan Jurewica states that "the reason that an athlete receives a scholarship is for reimbursement for their time given to their university (sic). Well, it was calculated here at Wisconsin that an athlete earns \$1.35 an hour for the 20 hours a week of mandatory workouts. The last time I checked, the minimum wage was more than \$1.35 an hour. And that doesn't even count the amount of volunteer time athletes put into lifting and other activities that are necessary to be at a competitive physical level..." (Wilstein). The NCAA itself acknowledges that "...athletic grants and scholarships generally fall \$2000 to \$2500 short of the cost of campus life, including reasonable amounts for food, entertainment, laundry, clothes and travel..." (Wilstein).

There are also complaints against the amateurism rule regarding the professional draft and professional leagues. In the case of *Jones v. NCAA*, Jones argued that the eligibility rules and standards for the NCAA violate the Sherman Antitrust Act. Jones complained that the NCAA illegally limited the student-athletes' activities and choices by instituting these rules and that these rules "...intentionally sought to bar student-athletes

from intercollegiate hockey...” The court in *Jones v. NCAA* found that the NCAA did not violate section I of the Sherman Act because the limitation on access to sports set by the NCAA was “...incidental to the NCAA’s legitimate purpose of promoting amateurism in collegiate sports.” The court also reasoned that “...the NCAA actions with respect to eligibility standards are not commercial or business-like within the context of the Sherman Act and the student-athlete is not a competitor with the NCAA. Third, the [reasoning concluded] that any limitation of access experienced by the prospective student-athlete as a result of the eligibility rules is purely incidental to the NCAA’s legitimate purpose of promoting amateurism” (Kobin).

In another court case against the NCAA, *McCormack v. NCAA*, McCormack challenged the NCAA rules that limit compensation to student-athletes. Again, as in the *Jones* case, McCormack claimed that this was in violation of the Sherman Act. The courts found for the NCAA stating that the NCAA rules “...preserved amateurism and educational components of collegiate football. The amateurism and educational components of collegiate football distinguished the sport from professional football.” The court also found that “...the NCAA rules with respect to compensation were pro-competitive because without the amateurism and educational components, collegiate football might perish due to a lack of distinction from professional football.” In *Gaines v. NCAA* the plaintiff argued that it was against the Sherman Act for the NCAA to declare Gaines ineligible under the no agent no draft rules. Again the court found that the NCAA’s rules regarding no agent no draft were not “...commercial in nature, but rather preserved the amateurism and educational components of collegiate sports.” (Kobin)

In *Banks v. NCAA*, another case challenging the rules of the NCAA, a football player at Notre Dame entered the NFL draft; he was not taken, so he decided he wanted to return to college to play. However, because of the NCAA rules regarding declaration for the draft, he was ruled ineligible. Banks argued that the NCAA had taken away his right to play collegiate football. Again the courts found in favor of the NCAA. The courts reasoned that "...the no agent and no draft rules do not restrain a market, do promote amateurism, do promote the educational nature of collegiate football, and are procompetitive" (Kobin).

There have been numerous violations of these amateurism rules as well as more challenges to their legality. The NCAA so far has remained behind its amateurism rule, but lately there have been signs of softening. Recently the NCAA has changed its mind regarding the employment of athletes during the school year. Student-athletes have been allowed to work as often and for as much as they want during breaks and vacations, barring that they receive special treatment based on their athletic skills. In 1998 the NCAA altered its stance further by making effective Bylaw 15.2.6.1, which states that:

In Division I, a student-athlete may receive earnings from legitimate on- or off-campus employment during a semester or term time in combination with other financial aid included in the student-athlete's individual financial aid limit up to the value of a full grant plus \$2,000, provided:

- a) The student has spent one academic year in residence certifying the institution and
- b) The student-athlete is eligible academically to compete for the institution. (www.ncaa.org)

With the institution of this rule student-athletes can hold jobs that will pay for the part of their education that the scholarship does not cover, as well as an extra \$2,000 for personal expenses.

The NCAA also adjusted its Draft List rule which states that "...an individual loses amateur status in a particular sport when the individual asks to be placed on a draft or supplemental draft list of a professional league..." (www.ncaa.org). In 1997, after much lobbying by men's basketball coaches and players, the NCAA made effective Bylaw 12.2.4.2.1 which states that:

A student-athlete in the sport of basketball may enter a professional league's draft one time during his or her collegiate career without jeopardizing eligibility in that sport, provided the student-athlete is not drafted by any team in that league and the student-athlete declares his or her intention to resume intercollegiate participation within 30 days after the draft. The student-athlete's declaration of intent shall be in writing to the institution's director of athletics. (www.ncaa.org)

Now a collegiate basketball player may decide to forgo his remaining eligibility and enter the draft. If he does not like where he was drafted or what the team offers him, he is free to be reinstated into collegiate athletics again. This rule allows athletes to test the waters and provides some negotiating leverage with the professional teams. To help counter this leverage the National Basketball Association, in response to the NCAA rule, altered its rules as well. Now the league declares that once a player is drafted, a team holds the rights to the player until one year after he graduates. This means that if a player is drafted after his sophomore year and then decides to go back to school, the team

controls that player's professional career until one year after he graduates, or, in the case of a sophomore, for the next three years that player can not be drafted and signed by another team.

The NCAA has further softened its stance on amateurism in Division II. In January 2001 "...delegates from more than 260 Division II schools overwhelmingly approved allowing students to participate in certain activities previously forbidden under the organization's amateurism bylaws. The new legislation goes into effect August 1, 2001" (NCAA Division II). Under these new rules athletes can sign contracts with professional teams and organizations, play for them, and be paid by them, and may still retain the ability to enter college and play collegiate sports following their professional career. "Athletes will have the length of their college eligibility limited by the time spent in the professional ranks" (NCAA Division II). The rule will work in this way: suppose a baseball player graduates from high school in 2002. He then decides to play professionally for two years. After two years he decides he wants to attend college and play baseball there. With this new rule he must first be required to fulfill one year of residence at the college and then will have two seasons of eligibility left. Division I schools were considering a similar package of legislation to be discussed at their annual meetings in 2001, but the topic was shelved for another year. So, for now, athletes can only come back to college to compete after playing professionally for a Division II school. Both of these new rules allow athletes to explore the professional ranks and still have the option of returning to college to play and receive a college education.

Proposals have also been made to help student-athletes to receive money beyond their scholarship. This money would be from the revenue schools receive from the

athletic department. There have been proposals to the NCAA that would allow for student-athletes in sports that produce revenue for the school to receive a portion of that money either directly or set the money in a trust fund from which they can take money for personal expenses. There have also been proposals that would provide stipends for student-athletes. Regarding amateurism, there has been a proposal by the football community to expand the Basketball No Draft Exemption bylaw to cover football as well.

The problem I see with these proposals is that they put the integrity and the history of the NCAA in jeopardy. The NCAA was founded on amateurism. Whether right or wrong it is in the bylaws of the association and has been followed for at least a half-century. The NCAA assumes that student-athletes are individuals who want an education and see athletics as an opportunity to gain that education at little or no financial cost to the student. This is true for the majority of NCAA student-athletes.

Also, there is the nagging issue of the small percentage of athletes who perceive that they will have a career in athletics. These student-athletes look at the NCAA as a quasi-minor league system, where they can hone their skills before moving onto the lucrative major league level. Along with this minor league theory is the idea that because they are working solely for a career in athletics, they should be compensated just as are the minor league baseball and hockey players who forgo their college education. But here is where the student-athletes do not take into account the amount of money that is invested in them which is not immediately apparent. Student-athletes on scholarship receive tuition, fees, room, board, books, transportation, and emergency funds. They also have access to doctors, dentists, optometrists, surgeons, physical therapists, psychologists, massage therapists and more without charge. They receive their

medications for free. They receive tutoring and access to advanced technology for free. They receive clothing, shoes, bags, hats, socks, and can have their practice and game clothes washed for free. Student-athletes receive the opportunity to travel across the country by car, bus, van or airplane and visit places they have never been like Alaska or Hawaii. On these trips they receive free room and food and entertainment. Often talented student-athletes receive admission to universities based almost solely on their athletic accomplishments. "At some schools, sixty percent of special admissions are athletes..." (Chin). These student-athletes then receive the opportunity to receive a top-notch education, and often if they cannot complete the required courses in four years, their scholarships cover another year as well as summer school. There are very few academic scholarships that will grant these dispensations. These student-athletes who complain never take into account the value of the education that they are receiving. Theodore Roosevelt once said that "...play is not business, and it is a very poor business indeed for a college man to learn nothing but sport..." (Brown). At a private institution the debt that a student can amass over four or more years can be well in excess of \$100,000. These full-scholarship student-athletes have the ability to walk away from school with a degree and absolutely no debt. That alone is worth the extra sprint after practice.

Still the student-athletes feel that they are being exploited because collegiate sports are such a vastly commercialized business. They feel that all athletic departments are rolling in the money and they deserve a share in it. They are wrong. Non-revenue sports like tennis, softball, and gymnastics never make money for the athletic department. And the perception that football and basketball garner large amounts of money for these

institutions is wrong as well. "In 1993, the average profit for Division I-A schools from athletics was only \$660,000; after support from the institution was subtracted, the average program lost \$174,000..." (Brown). Athletic departments spend the money they generate to fund athletic scholarships, athletic training facilities, athlete educational services, and non-revenue sports also at the school. Overall there are only a handful of schools that actually make a profit on their athletic departments.

Opening the issue of stipends and paying student-athletes brings up even more troubles, in my opinion. First would be the obvious: where would the money come from? For most schools the athletic department already operates in the red. Paying out more money to athletes would put an even greater strain on the department. To do this, schools would have to raise fees, for all students (which in turn would raise scholarship costs), or schools could do this by dropping all non-revenue sports. The latter should never be an option. These non-revenue sports provide educational opportunities for more student-athletes than the revenue sports. And, more than likely, these are the athletes who realize they will not have careers as professionals; therefore they may need the education even more. These non-revenue sports did not choose to be this way. They have been around just as long as revenue sports; they have just not been marketed at such a high intensity.

Another question that I think the stipends would pose, would be which athletes would be paid and how much? Would only the star athletes who people come to see receive the benefits? Obviously most of the fans, both in the stands and watching on television, do not tune in to watch the ninth man off the bench. They are paying money to see the stars. So should only the stars be paid? This would create animosity on the teams. Teams need to be composed of star players and bit players in order to succeed.

But if all players are paid, what is the incentive for the star player to continue at his or her level of play or even bother to continue in college sports? Overall there will be a disparity and animosity with any form of stipend payment. This also brings about the question of whether non-revenue athletes should also be paid. Even though these athletes bring in no money for the school, should they receive stipends because they put in just as much hard work as the football team? This discrimination (particularly because most women's sports are non-revenue), will bring up many legal cases. This is also unfair for the revenue sports because they will have to support the non-revenue sports so that they, too, are treated equally. The revenue sports will complain because they have to support sports that bring no money into the school. However the revenue sports fail to consider the fact that they often cost much more to operate than the non-revenue sports. Paying student-athletes also brings up the notion that if the schools started paying their players and could no longer afford to keep all the non-revenue sports, then the NCAA, in my opinion, would become solely a minor league system for basketball and football. The NCAA would no longer hold any educational standards, and this would lead to the athletic departments becoming separate entities from the schools. They would become minor league organizations who just happen to take up residence on the college campus.

And, finally, the proposals will bring up the problem of how a small school could ever compete with a one of the larger schools who actually makes a profit on its athletic department? A school like Ball State University in Muncie, IN would never be able to compete economically with Ohio State University in Columbus, OH. Both schools are Division I schools that support Division I-A football teams. But if Ohio State were able to pay its players more than Ball State, then BSU would never be able to compete in

recruiting the same type of athlete. Would Ball State then just have to drop its athletic department completely because it could not convince any athletes to compete for a free education solely? The reality is that the overwhelming majority of schools could not afford to pay their student-athletes at all, and most could not do so with equitable standards, so this would ruin college athletics.

Another idea that has been brought to the NCAA has been to expand the No Draft Exemption rule to cover football as well. The problem with the No Draft rule is that it puts a college coach and program in a bad spot. For example, the football draft is held in the spring, and so are spring practices. If a player declares himself eligible for the draft he misses all those practices. If he decides he wants to come back, he has already hurt his team by missing a semester of workouts and practices. He may have also lost his job because someone else has stepped up and learned the position. Secondly, coaches will want to take the scholarship of the player who has just declared himself draft-eligible and use it to recruit another player from high school. What happens when that player then decides to return to school? If the scholarship is given back to him a contract is breached between the high school recruit and the college; if the scholarship cannot be given back to the draft-eligible player, he is possibly unable to continue to attend school because he no longer has a scholarship. It is also unfair to ask coaches not to use scholarships in case a player decides to return to play. This not only hurts the team, but also may hurt a high school graduate who needs a way to pay for his education.

The bottom line on the expansion of the No Draft rule is that the student-athletes need to start taking responsibility for themselves. Each university and the NCAA educates the student-athletes on what is considered endangering to their eligibility and

what is not. Each university has a panel whose job it is to help potential professional athletes to decide their worth and their possible draft placement if they stay in school or if they decide to leave early. All student-athletes should have access to these panels as well as independent organizations outside of the schools that provide this service.

Student-athletes need to be treated just like other students who decide to leave school to pursue a job offer. Once that student withdraws from school he loses his non-athletic scholarship. The same applies to student-athletes. Once they declare themselves eligible for the draft or sign a professional contract, they lose their athletic scholarship. If they choose to return to school, they must find other ways to finance their education. Maybe the NCAA should look into creating a fund for these student-athletes. These athletes can then apply to the scholarship fund so that they may continue their education. If these athletes want to continue to play the sport, they can always join another league.

The NCAA is not a monopoly. Athletes can join independent minor league systems or join club teams or travel to Europe to play. None of these leagues require a player be working toward a degree and maintain a certain grade point average, therefore, the athlete can concentrate solely on his or her athletic talents without that “meddlesome education” getting in the way. For those who are drafted and then sign a contract, an education clause is a great suggestion. This way when a player can no longer compete, he can go back to school to continue his education and the professional team will pay for it.

Ideally, the National Collegiate Athletic Association should be a venue for amateur athletes to compete in athletics and achieve their educational goals, not be a minor league system. The amateurism rules have been set up to promote fairness within

the collegiate competitions as well as to decipher the college game from the professional game. Overall these rules are not a bother to the majority of student-athletes. But for those who are bothered by these rules, they do cause a dilemma and that is when personal accountability needs to come into play. There comes a point when there are no more second chances. The student-athletes are educated on what is and is not acceptable and they must then make decisions that will impact them and their team's present and future. For those athletes who feel that they need to be compensated monetarily for their performance, there are minor league systems, club teams, and foreign leagues. This small percentage of perceived potential professional athletes should not endanger the integrity and well being for the NCAA, its members, and the student-athletes.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association was founded on the belief that its athletes would be amateur student-athletes. The athletes have to meet standards in the classroom, as well as on the playing field. To have the privilege to compete in NCAA competition, the athletes also must vow not to take money for their play or sign with an agent. All of these rules are simply stated, easily followed, and universally enforced. These rules are also what distinguishes college basketball from the National Basketball Association and college football from the National Football League. To further ensure that the collegiate game is separate from the professional game and that the NCAA abides by its principles, the NCAA's current stance on amateurism must not be changed.

Works Cited

- Brown, Jeff. "1996 Spring Symposium: Issues Facing College Athletics." The Kansas Journal of Law & Public Policy. (1996): 147- 152.
- Chin, Christopher. "Illegal Procedure: The NCAA's Unlawful Restraint of the Student-Athlete." Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review. (1993): 1213- 1250.
- Dorsey, Steve. "An Ideals Solution." The Sporting News. 1 July 1996: 47.
- Kobin, Thomas. "The National Collegiate Athletic Association's No Agent and No Draft Rules: The Realities of Collegiate Sports are Forcing Change." Seton Hall Journal of Sport Law. (1994): 483- 525.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association Online. Online < www.ncaa.org > 16 October 2000.
- "NCAA Approves Budget Increases." TotalSports Net. 11 August 2000. Online. <www.totalsports.net > 23 October 2000.
- "NCAA Division II Approves Amateurism Legislation." The Associated Press. 9 January 2001.
- Wilstein, Steve. "Amateurism Rules: The Sham and Shame of NCAA Suspensions." The Associated Press. 29 March 2000.

Works Consulted

- Acaín, Michael. "Revenue Sharing: A Simple Cure for the Exploitation of College Athletes." Loyola of Los Angeles Entertainment Law Journal. (1998): 307-344.
- "Athletic Directors Begin Talking About Paying College Athletes." News & Record (Greensboro, NC). 13 June 1996: C5.
- Davis, Timothy. "Sports law in the 21st Century: Intercollegiate Athletics in the Next Millenium: A Framework for Evaluating Reform Proposals." Marquette University Sports Law Journal. (1999): 253- 270.
- Fisher, Todd. "Amateurism and Intercollegiate Athletics: The Double Standard of Section 12.2.4.2.1." Sports Lawyers Journal. (1996): 1-23.
- Geranios, Nicholas. "Conference Leaders: No Way on Pay for Play." The Associated Press. 27 June 1996.
- Gillard, John. "Smoke, Mirrors, and NCAA Bylaw 12.2.4.2.1: An Analysis of College Basketball's Thirty-Day Rule and the Continued Exploitation of College Cagers." Marquette University Sports Law Journal. (1995): 173-192.
- Gough, Russ. "Do As We Say, Not As We Do." The Sporting News. 5 February 1996: 9.
- McGraw, Mike. "Amateurism Pays Top Dollar for Some: NCAA Permeated with Perks." The Kansas City Star. 6 October 1997. Online. < www.kcstar.com > 23 October 2000.
- McGraw, Mike. "Bending the Rules to Win: MVP Made Grade Only on the Court." The Kansas City Star. 10 October 1997. Online. < www.kcstar.com > 23 October 2000.
- McGraw, Mike, Rock, Steven, and Dillon, Karen. "Revenues Dominate the College Sports World." The Kansas City Star. 5 October 1997. Online. <www.kcstar.com> 23 October 2000.
- Mitten, Matthew. "Special Issue: Education Law: University Price Competition for Elite Students and Athletes: Illusions and Realities." South Texas Law Review. (1995): 59- 83.
- "NCAA boss: Pay-for-Play Lacks Support." The Baltimore Sun. 31 March 1995: 2C.

Rock, Steve. "NCAA Mulls Softening Stance on Amateurism." The Daily Camera. 7 Feb. 2000. Online. < www.bouldershopping.com/buffzone/sports > 23 October 2000.

Rock, Steven, and McGraw, Mike. "Coaches' Pay, Outside Income Soaring." The Kansas City Star. 6 October 1997. Online. < www.kcstar.com > 23 October 2000.

Schott, Stephen. "Give Them What They Deserve: Compensating the Student-Athlete for Participation in Intercollegiate Athletics." Sports Lawyers Journal. (1996): 25-49.

"Sherman Act Invalidation of the NCAA Amateurism Rules." Harvard Law Review. (1992): 1299-1317.

Smizik, Bob. "Paying College Athletes? NCAA Should Pocket that Idea." Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. 16 June 1996. Sec D: 12.

Wilstein, Steve. "NCAA Faces Risky Future, As Athletes Feel Exploited." Gatorsports. 26 December 1996. Online. < www.gatorsports.com > 23 October 2000.